

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

This preliminary amendment is submitted with a request for continued examination. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects Claims 14, 22, and 41-43 as well as Claims 15-21 and 23-25 by dependency under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph on the basis that the specification does not disclose “but not a destination location” as recited by Claims 14, 22, and 41-43. Claims 14 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 4,876,651 to Dawson et al. (“Dawson”). Claims 1-13, 15-21, and 23-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dawson in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,498,982 to Bellesfield et al. (“Bellesfield”) and in further view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,948,040 to DeLorme et al. (“Delorme”).

Applicants have amended independent Claims 1, 7, 8, and 22 to further patentably distinguish the cited references. Claims 41-43 have been canceled. In light of the amendments and subsequent remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance.

**The Rejection of Claims 14, 22, and 41-43 under § 112 is Overcome**

Applicants initially note that Claims 41-43 have been cancelled. However, the recitations of Claims 41-43 have been incorporated into independent Claims 1, 7, and 8, respectively and accordingly the ensuing discussion applies to Claims 1, 7, and 8 as well as Claims 14 and 22.

The Examiner asserts that the specification does not disclose “...but not a destination location...” as recited in Claims 14, 22, and 41-43 (now recited in Claims 1, 7, 8, 14, and 22). Applicants, however, respectfully traverse the Examiner’s assertion and submit that the recitation is disclosed in the specification. For reference, the full recitation at issue is that a request comprises a departure location, but not a destination location. In this regard, a user may enter a request comprising criteria. The criteria may include a departure location as well as additional search criteria, but not a destination location.

Support for the recitation may be found in several places in the specification. Most prominently, Applicants point the Examiner to FIG. 5 as well as the discussion

thereof found at paragraphs 56 and 57 of the present application. In this regard, data box 510 is used to select a “Departure City,” hence representing receiving a request comprising a “departure location.” It may be seen, that none of click buttons 502-506 and data boxes 508-516 are used to enter a destination location for the request, for which a determination or query may be initiated, for example, by pressing the “Search Now” button illustrated in FIG. 5. In response to the query, a plurality of possible destination locations may be determined and a set of points corresponding to the potential destination locations may be overlaid on a map as illustrated in FIG. 5. Thus, the received request includes a departure location, but not a destination location. Indeed, it would be entirely counter intuitive for a user to enter a destination location as criteria in a request and then receive a plurality of potential destination locations in response to the request.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that the specification fully supports the recitation “...but not a destination location...” and the rejection under § 112 is therefore overcome.

Claims 14 and 22 are Patentably Distinct from the Cited Reference

The Examiner finds that independent Claims 14 and 22 are obvious in view of Dawson. Applicants have amended Claim 22 to further clarify that the user request does not include a destination location. Independent Claims 14 and 22 recite a method for providing travel information and a method for a user to obtain travel information, respectively. A method for providing travel information according to Claim 14 includes receiving a request including a departure location, but not a destination location, and a set of user-defined criteria. The method also includes determining a plurality of potential destination locations based at least in part upon the set of user-defined criteria. The method further includes generating data representative of a map including a set of points corresponding to the departure location and any airports having carrier service from the departure location to the plurality of determined potential destination locations and transmitting the generated map.

Briefly, Dawson discloses a digital mapping display system for an aircraft, wherein map data from a memory unit is periodically loaded into cache memory in accordance with the aircraft trajectory. Segments of map data depicting terrain and cultural features such as hydrology, vegetation, and airports are then displayed on a

display in accordance with the aircraft's real time coordinate position and heading. *See, e.g.* Col 1, line 64 – Col 2, line 38 of Dawson.

Applicants continue to submit that Dawson does not teach or suggest that the request includes a departure location, but not a destination location and further that the generated map includes a set of points corresponding to the departure location and any airports having carrier service from the departure location to a plurality of potential destination locations determined at least in part based upon the set of user-defined criteria. In this regard, a user may enter a departure location and a set of criteria, such as, for example, a maximum airfare, distance, weather condition, and/or number of travelers. *See, e.g.*, paragraphs 10, 26, and 56. A plurality of potential destination locations, e.g. airports, to which the user may travel from the indicated departure location are determined based at least in part upon the set of criteria and a map is generated including overlaid points representing those potential destination locations and the indicated departure location.

In contrast to amended Claims 14 and 22, Dawson simply discloses a digital mapping display system for use in an aircraft displaying a map of terrain and cultural features such as hydrography, vegetation, and airports based upon the aircraft's current position and heading. *See, e.g.* the abstract and Col 1, line 62 - Col 2, line 38 of Dawson. Dawson does not teach or suggest determining a plurality of potential destination locations based at least in part upon a set of user-defined criteria included in a request including a departure location but not a destination location. Indeed, the Examiner, admits that Dawson does not disclose "but not a destination location." *See*, section 6 on page 5 of the Office Action. Furthermore, Dawson does not teach or suggest generating a map including a set of points corresponding to the departure location and the plurality of determined potential destination locations. Instead, at most Dawson discloses displaying a terrain map based upon an aircraft's current position and heading, i.e. a single point map with information about an inherent immediate destination based upon the aircraft's heading.

Further, Applicants take issue with the Examiner's characterization of Claims 14 and 22 in the Office Action. The Examiner states:

[H]owever, the examiner submits that from other user's input criteria, and that user selection of available travel's legs on screen – a destination must be selected after all, whether that information come from a display, or is made by a user from display information on screen – a user can make selections in his/her head of travel legs from displayed information is not new.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to include a pair of airports in Dawson to answer normal questions of WHAT? WHERE? In Internet searching in order to get a travel plan and using selected one as a destination/point of interest (even if he/she has not select a direct flight); for the advantage of using available database in servers for remote accessibility, and for flexible selection as desired with available schedule/plans.

In response to Examiner's comments, Applicants submit that Claim 14 and 22 are directed to methods for providing travel information comprising a plurality of potential destination locations represented as a set of points on a map overlay to a user in response to a request comprising a departure location, but not a destination location. Hence, the Examiner's discussion of "user selection of available travel's legs on screen" is nowhere recited in either Claim 14 or 22. Further, Applicants note that even if Claims 14 or 22 did recite user selection of one of the plurality of potential destination locations shown on the provided map, user selection of such would be in response to a set of points returned in response to an initial request comprising a departure location, but not a destination location. In this regard, the Examiner has totally failed to show anywhere that Dawson or any of the other cited references teaches or suggests receiving a request comprising a departure location, but not a destination location or generating a map comprising a set of points corresponding to a plurality of potential destination locations determined based at least in part upon the request. The Examiner has further failed to show how it would be obvious to modify Dawson to arrive at such a method.

With regard to the Examiner's comment that, "[i]t would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to include a pair of airports in Dawson to answer normal questions of WHAT? WHERE? In Internet searching in order to get a travel plan and using selected one as a destination/point of interest," Applicants again point out that this does not relate to how Dawson teaches or suggests or how it would be

obvious to modify Dawson to receive a request comprising a departure location, but not a destination location. Further, Applicants again point out that each pair of airports is representative of a user-identified departure location in the request and a potential destination location determined based upon the request, which comprises a departure location, but not a destination location. Dawson does not teach or suggest a request comprising a departure location, but not a destination location and the Examiner's discussion of including a pair of airports in Dawson does nothing to explain why it would be obvious, let alone desirous, to modify Dawson as such.

Therefore, Applicants submit that Claims 14 and 22 are patentably distinct from Dawson and accordingly, the rejection is overcome and Claims 14 and 22 are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1, 7, and 8 are Patentably Distinct from the Cited References

Independent Claims 1, 7, and 8 recite a method for graphically displaying travel information on an electronic map within a network environment, a system for distributing travel information in a network, and a travel information system, respectively.

Applicants have amended independent Claims 1, 7, and 8 to include the recitations of now cancelled dependent Claims 41, 42, and 43, respectively. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected independent Claims 1, 7, and 8 as well as Claims 41-43 as being obvious based upon the combination of Dawson, Bellesfield, and DeLorme.

Briefly, Bellesfield discloses an automated travel planning apparatus and method that includes a map database, a routing database and a places of interest database. In operation, upon receipt of a selected geographic region, the apparatus displays a bit-mapped image of the region from images in the map database. A user then selects a departure and destination point, and the routing database is used to generate a route between the selected departure and destination points. Also, if the user requests a list of places of interest near the route, the places of interest database can be utilized to generate a list of places of interest that are within a predetermined distance of the generated route.

DeLorme discloses a travel reservation information and planning system and method. According to the method, users engage in a planning process for travel between an origin and destination via a number of intermediate waypoints. DeLorme allows users

to plan, revise or edit travel plans, as well as preview alternate routes, select points of interest, and compare times and costs of transportation options such that the users can achieve a final travel plan. For example, the system can facilitate a user planning a trip having a known travel destination as well as a date/time of arrival at the destination around which to build the trip.

Applicants continue to submit that Dawson is non-analogous to the claimed invention, as argued in the response to the previous Office Action, and as such, cannot properly be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). MPEP § 2141.01(a). The Examiner states that, “these cited art suggest very fundamental/basic steps/tools in everyday’s application for travel planning to one with skill in the art.” Applicants continue to disagree with the Examiner, however. Dawson is related to a digital mapping display system for an aircraft. Such a “tool” as taught by Dawson would not be available for everyday consumer travel planning to one with skill in the art. Cost impracticalities as well as diverging intended uses make Dawson non-analogous to a consumer travel planning system as claimed in the present invention.

Moreover, Applicants continue to submit, as argued in the response to the previous Office Action, that even if Dawson is analogous art, there is not any apparent reason to combine Dawson with Bellesfield and DeLorme. In the instant case, Dawson, as described above, is related to a navigational aid for aircraft. In contrast, Bellesfield and DeLorme are both directed to systems for enabling consumers to plan travel itineraries. There would be absolutely no motivation for one skilled in the art to combine an aircraft navigational mapping system with consumer travel planning systems to arrive at the consumer travel planning methods and systems claimed by the present application.

In spite of the Applicants’ disagreement with the Examiner’s continued application of the Dawson reference, Applicants have amended independent Claims 1, 7, and 8 to recite that the request comprises a departure location, but not a destination location and that the determined solution set is representative of a plurality of potential destination locations so as to further patentably distinguish the cited references.

Applicants submit that Dawson does not teach or suggest the recitations added to amended independent Claims 1, 7, and 8 for the same reasons as argued above in connection with Claims 14 and 22. Further, neither Bellesfield nor DeLorme teaches or

suggests the added recitations either and indeed, Applicants note that the Examiner has not cited Bellesfield or DeLorme for such proposition as the Examiner's argument rejecting Claims 41-43 merely incorporates the Examiner's rationale rejecting Claim 14.

Therefore, Applicants submit that Claims 1, 7, and 8 are patentably distinct from the cited references, taken alone or in combination, and accordingly, the rejection is overcome and Claims 1, 7, and 8 are in condition for allowance.

The Dependent Claims are Patentably Distinct from the Cited References

As the dependent claims include each of the recitations of a respective independent claim, Applicants further submit that the rejections of the dependent claims are overcome for at least the reasons cited above.

## CONCLUSION

In view of the amended claims and remarks presented above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the present claims of the present application are in condition for immediate allowance. It is therefore respectfully requested that a Notice of Allowance be issued. The Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney to resolve any remaining issues in order to expedite examination of the present application.

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 CFR § 1.136(a), and any fee required therefore (including fees for net addition of claims) is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 16-0605.

Respectfully submitted,



Charles A. Leyes  
Registration No. 61,317

**Customer No. 00826**  
**ALSTON & BIRD LLP**  
Bank of America Plaza  
101 South Tryon Street, Suite 4000  
Charlotte, NC 28280-4000  
Tel Charlotte Office (704) 444-1000  
Fax Charlotte Office (704) 444-1111

ELECTRONICALLY FILED USING THE EFS-WEB ELECTRONIC FILING SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE ON August 20, 2008.